
A POLÍTICA EXTERNA DOS EUA NO CONTEXTO DO MUNDO EURO-ATLÂNTICO

Conferência incluída no Programa do Curso de Defesa Nacional (CDN96), proferida pela Embaixadora dos Estados Unidos em Portugal, no IDN em Lisboa, em 17 de Janeiro de 1996.

Sumário:

O tema central desta intervenção diz respeito ao partenariado transatlântico – ligação estratégica entre os Estados Unidos e a Europa e o seu empenhamento na segurança europeia – com mútuos benefícios e objectivos comuns. Destacam-se algumas áreas de referência, nomeadamente: a situação na Bósnia, que representa o maior desafio para a segurança da Europa no pós-guerra fria; o alargamento da NATO aos países do Leste Europeu; a nova Agenda transatlântica; as conversações para a integração da Rússia na Arquitectura Europeia; e, o fortalecimento da OSCE no apoio à democracia e direitos humanos.

Elizabeth Frawley Bagley

A POLÍTICA EXTERNA DOS EUA NO CONTEXTO DO MUNDO EURO-ATLÂNTICO

Thank you very much for inviting me to speak to you today. U.S. Ambassadors have addressed the *Instituto da Defesa Nacional* for several years and this is the second time I have had the privilege. I appreciate the opportunity to continue the tradition.

The perennial subject of this talk – the role of the U.S. in European security – is always important, but even more so in 1996 with both U.S. and Portuguese troops engaged in Bosnia, and with the current restructuring of the European security architecture. I will also touch on a related theme, a twist on the usual formulation, and that is the role of Europe in U.S. security affairs.

Looking back over the year since I last spoke to the *Instituto*, I believe I no longer have to try to convince you of the American commitment to European security, the importance of an active U.S. role and the absolute need for a transatlantic partnership. A brief review of some of the themes I covered last year and developments since then illustrate my point:

- In Bosnia, we were well into the third winter of war without a clear road to a solution in sight. Divisions between the U.S. and some allies on what to do were extremely frustrating, leading some commentators to proclaim the irrelevance of NATO to security challenges even on its doorstep. The horrors of the mortar attack in Tuzla and Serb atrocities after the fall of Srebrenica were still ahead of us.
- NATO began to adapt to meet the new conditions in Europe. Enlargement of the Alliance was accepted in principle, PFP was engaged, and a study of the implications of enlargement was launched.
- NATO's relations with Russia, critical for building stability and security on the continent, were frayed largely because of Russian misunderstandings about NATO enlargement. Historically-based

differences in approach to the conflict in Bosnia also contributed to Russian suspicions about NATO's motives.

- The CSCE became the OSCE and emerged from the Budapest summit empowered and energized for new tasks.
- And finally, in an area of great importance to Portugal, the completion of a new Lajes Agreement designed to meet the new conditions and challenges in our bilateral security relations remained tantalizingly just out of reach.

As I speak to you now, I have a dramatically positive review to make of these areas. I do not mean to suggest that we have reached final resolution on these issues; that is not the nature of international relations. However, I can point to very promising developments in some difficult areas. In my opinion, and with no small pride, I would argue that they prove strong U.S. engagement in Europe and demonstrate beyond question what the transatlantic partnership can accomplish for the mutual benefit of Europe and the U.S.

- In Bosnia, the situation remains difficult and dangerous, but we in the international community have reconciled many of our divisions and rediscovered common purpose in meeting the greatest European security challenge of the post-cold war era. The Dayton Agreement has provided the framework for an end to the worst armed conflict in Europe in half a century. And, significantly, Russia and many other former Warsaw Pact adversaries will participate with NATO forces in IFOR as valuable partners in implementing the peace.
- NATO enlargement is on track, proceeding in a deliberate and transparent manner. The process of completing the enlargement study clarified responsibilities as well as benefits to prospective new members and NATO member nations alike. The enlargement process enters the next phase this year, in which the Alliance will hold intensive consultations with prospective new members.
- The OSCE is poised to move into its rightful place as a major building block of European security, in part because of its participation in the peace process in Bosnia. Having established its expertise in Bosnia in the areas of human rights monitoring, refugee care and organizing elections, the OSCE's evolving institutional strength complements NATO's defense structures as another building block for general European security.

These notable developments over the past 12 months resonate with the elements of President Clinton's comprehensive strategy for European security and transatlantic relations which I will enumerate later. The fundamental objective of our policy is to increase stability and prosperity throughout the North Atlantic area and Europe. The new chances for peace in the Middle East and Northern Ireland also owe much to the steady U.S. course over the past few years.

The projection of steady, engaged leadership is the fundamental goal of the Clinton administration's foreign policy. This leadership, indispensable to U.S.-European cooperation, combines a clear assessment of U.S. national security interests with the traditional concerns of the American people for a strong moral component in U.S. foreign policy. And those interests are intimately tied to stability and prosperity in Europe, as they have been for nearly all of this century.

The role I am describing, however, does not imply leadership solely for its own sake, or dominance. It means an active partnership with Europe for the mutual benefit of both sides of the Atlantic. As Assistant Secretary Richard Holbrooke noted in his seminal «Foreign Affairs» article last year, the U.S. is a European power, not *in* Europe but still an indivisible part of it. We ignore this fundamental fact only at the peril of the security of both sides of the Atlantic.

I would also like to underline one other aspect of this partnership that may not always be well understood in Europe. Active U.S. engagement in Europe is sustained in the formation of a healthy, functioning partnership with Europe. We could not have generated or maintained the kind of commitment and effort we displayed in the past months without the cooperation of a strong Europe. «A superpower,» President Clinton said in his address to the nation on the Bosnia peace force, «cannot do everything everywhere and cannot do it alone.» So we require the continued reliable partnership of the Alliance and other European states which share our values and interests to help us accomplish our common objectives.

What is our principal shared common objective? It remains very much as it was last year: to extend and enhance stability, security and prosperity in the North Atlantic area and Europe. From the U.S. vantage point, this consists of four key elements:

- 1st the continued adaptation and evolution of NATO;
- 2nd the activation of the New Transatlantic Agenda;

- 3rd the integration of Russia into European security and economic architecture; and
- 4th the engagement of a strengthened OSCE.

ADAPTATION AND EVOLUTION OF NATO

The process of change in NATO, underway since the London Summit in July 1990, is considerably more advanced than is generally understood. It began with changes in NATO strategy and proceeded through changes in structures to meet new security conditions. The evolution of NATO is clearly visible today in the careful path toward enlargement, the establishment of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), where political consultations are held with the enemies of just a few years ago, and Partnership for Peace (PFP), which is successfully developing the patterns and habits of military cooperation with former adversaries. PFP in particular has been a great success with 25 partners, including Russia, and is an important feature of the European security landscape. PFP will help prepare potential new members of NATO for the responsibilities as well as the privileges of Alliance membership. It will also prepare nations that will not join NATO to cooperate with the Alliance in maintaining European security; PFP training has made participation in IFOR possible for a number of countries.

THE NEW TRANSATLANTIC AGENDA

One of the most important new developments in our policy is the New Transatlantic Agenda signed at the December U.S.-EU Summit in Madrid. In a very real sense, however, the Agenda is not as new as its expression in the Madrid document. In the early 60's, President Kennedy foresaw a «declaration of interdependence» that awaited a more perfect union in Europe. It is based on our common recognition that economic prosperity and opportunity are the foundation of security, and has gained impetus from the encouragement and support the U.S. continues to give to the process of European integration.

The Agenda, with its long-term economic, political and cultural dimensions, is the answer to doubts that arose in some quarters after the cold war as to whether the U.S. and Europe still shared common interests and whether the U.S. was still interested in and engaged with Europe. It has become increasingly

clear that the foundation of common interests and values remains unshaken and serves as a tremendous asset in facing new challenges such as the dangers of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and international crime. Last year, a number of highly-respected European figures publicized various ideas for a broad, structured transatlantic partnership to carry us forward into the next century. Secretary of State Christopher responded on behalf of the U.S. in a June 2 speech in Madrid in which he proposed a comprehensive strategy for European security with a new emphasis on political, economic and global cooperation. The Agenda also commits us to work together against international crime, terrorism and drug trafficking and to work together for the environment and the promotion of global trade and investment. The remarkable achievement of the December signing underscores yet again the firm and deepened ties of interdependence and partnership between the U.S. and Europe.

The challenge now is implementation, and we will meet that challenge together.

INTEGRATING RUSSIA INTO THE EUROPEAN ARCHITECTURE

I have already touched on this important aspect of our policy, but I would like to emphasize how important it is that we solve one of Europe's enduring security challenges by finding a positive role for Russia to play in European affairs. In fact, more progress has been made than is often recognized. Russia has joined PFP and participates actively in the NACC. It has obtained much of its "special relationship" with NATO in the 16 plus one format. Russia was a member of the Bosnia contact group, and – perhaps most importantly – has contributed troops to the Bosnia peace force. Russia still is not fully convinced that it has nothing to fear from a natural process of NATO enlargement, but we have succeeded in a substantial way in providing Russia with a voice befitting its importance to European security.

STRENGTHENING THE OSCE

The member nations of the OSCE provided it with new structures and support at last December's Budapest Summit to boost its role in maintaining security in the most comprehensive sense. The OSCE is the forum in which the U.S. and Canada join the countries of Europe and the former Soviet Union in

addressing their security concerns, contributing to a sense of stability and belonging to a community of like-minded democratic nations.

We expect that the OSCE will be indispensable in supporting democracy and human rights throughout the region. Considering that Europe's major challenges now do not emanate from opposing military blocs, but rather from ethnic and nationalistic tensions, territorial disputes, migration flows, organized crime and environmental damage, the OSCE's complementary role to NATO's provision of military security is clear. The new strength of the OSCE in its cooperation with other blocks of the European architecture will be clear in the multifaceted role it will play in implementing the peace in Bosnia in essential areas such as human rights monitoring, organizing elections, reconstruction and aiding refugees. Portugal, as host of this year's OSCE Summit, is taking a leading role in working with the Swiss chairman to ensure an outcome that will serve to reinforce the vital role of the OSCE in European security.

WHERE THEORY MEETS PRACTICE

The foregoing is the strategic foreign and security policy of the Clinton Administration. We believe it is coherent, logical and essential to our own interests and in the interests of those to whom we are so closely linked. But as policy, it is largely a guide; theory as opposed to action. What I would like to suggest to you now is that we, together with our European allies, actually have a testing ground where many of the hypotheses of our policies will be tested by actions. The testing ground is Bosnia.

We did not choose Bosnia as such a testing ground; tragically, it presented itself to us. But it is no accident that extraordinary U.S. political, diplomatic and military efforts have been focussed on that tragic conflict. We recognize, as the underlying fundamental truth in all of the policy pronouncements I have outlined for you, that there is no stability for the U.S. if there is instability in Europe. What Winston Churchill said in a different context – with regard to the founding of NATO – remains timelessly true: the new world must be kept engaged to redress the imbalances of the old.

The harsh and tragic testing ground of Bosnia reminds us of another fact that we must keep in mind: *there are no gains without risks*. It is a highly arguable hypothesis that earlier action by NATO and the U.S. could have had the same positive effect of creating an opportunity for peace; many conditions

on the ground and subsequently in the political relations of the parties had to change first. But it is absolutely certain that without the leadership to take the risks, to seize the opportunities, and to actively engage and promote the dialogue, the Bosnian conflict would have continued to fester, making an approach to more complete European stability impossible.

In the broadest historical sense, I believe that what we are witnessing in the creation of a New Transatlantic Agenda and a European security architecture is nothing less than the reassertion by Europe as a whole of the global role that many European nations – and not least Portugal – have played individually in various epochs. The evolving European role on the world stage will be vastly strengthened both by cooperation and unity within its own union and the reciprocal benefits of mutual support and solidarity with the U.S.

The burden of world leadership will pose new challenges and responsibilities. Bosnia has taught us, however, the costs of inaction. Solving the new issues we face won't be easy, but the U.S. and Europe will do it because it is the right way for them to move into the 21st century with greater security and opportunity for all of our peoples.

Our hopes for the future as we meet these challenges remind me of the words of Irish poet and Nobel prizewinner Seamus Heaney, which President Clinton quoted during his recent visit to Ireland. I think they are particularly relevant as we reflect on our common hopes and goals, and on the service of our men and women in Bosnia:

*History says, don't hope
on this side of the grave.
But then, once in a lifetime,
the longed-for tidal wave
of justice can rise up
and hope and history rhyme.*

*So hope for a great sea change
on the far side of revenge.
Believe that a further shore
is reachable from here.
Believe in miracles
and cures and healing wells.*

I believe with President Clinton that we – all of us – are indeed at a stage in our lives where hope and history do rhyme. Now it is our responsibility and our duty to seize this moment and to secure the fragile peace which we together have helped to forge.

Elizabeth Frawley Bagley